



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/823,729	04/14/2004	Takashi Watanabe	042341	5344
38834	7590	03/05/2009		
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP			EXAMINER	
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW			VU, DAVID	
SUITE 700			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20036			2818	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		03/05/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/823,729	Applicant(s) WATANABE ET AL.
	Examiner DAVID VU	Art Unit 2818

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 December 2008.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4, 12, 13, 28, 29 and 34 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-4, 12, 13, 28, 29 and 34 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 January 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.914

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the, fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/05/08 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-4, 12, 13, 28, 29 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The original disclosure does not include teaching “while only a polishing slurry is supplied onto the polishing pad....”

Any response to this “new matter” rejection should include the location in the original disclosure where the subject matter can be found.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-3, 12, 13, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U. S. C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zagrebelny (US Pat. 6,863,595).

Regarding claims 1, 3, 12 and 28, Zagrebelny discloses in Abstract and figs. 6-8 a semiconductor device fabrication method comprising the steps of: polishing a surface of a film-to-be-polished formed over a semiconductor substrate 140 with a polishing pad while only a polishing slurry is supplied onto the polishing pad to thereby planarize the surface of the film-to-be-polished (primary polishing step; col. 11, lines 62-67); and after the surface of the film-to-be-polished has been planarized (fig. 7), further polishing the surface of the film-to-be-polished with the polishing pad while polishing slurry and water are supplied onto the polishing pad (final polishing step with residual slurry particles 158 present on surface 156; fig. 7 and col. 14, lines 33-50), polishing slurry and water being supplied onto the polishing pad separately (Abstract and col. 14, lines 52-55); wherein polishing slurry comprises abrasive grains and a surfactant additive (col. 8, lines 2-16)

Regarding claims 2, 13 and 29, Zagrebelny discloses in Abstract and figs. 6-8 a semiconductor device fabrication method comprising the steps of: polishing a surface of a film-to-be-polished formed over a semiconductor substrate 140 with a polishing pad while only a

polishing slurry is supplied onto the polishing pad to thereby planarize the surface of the film-to-be-polished (primary polishing step; col. 11, lines 62-67); and after the surface of the film-to-be-polished has been planarized (fig. 7), further polishing the surface of the film-to-be-polished with the polishing pad while polishing slurry and water are supplied onto the polishing pad (final polishing step with residual slurry particles 158 present on surface 156; fig. 7 and col. 14, lines 33-50), polishing slurry and water being supplied onto the polishing pad separately (Abstract and col. 14, lines 52-55); wherein polishing slurry comprises abrasive grains and a surfactant additive (col. 8, lines 2-16); and wherein a water content in mixture of polishing slurry and water of the final polishing step (col. 14, lines 33-50) is higher than a water content in polishing slurry of the primary polishing step (primary polishing step without water; col. 11, lines 62-67 and Abstract).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(c), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claim 4 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over by Zagrebelny (US Pat. 6,863,595).

Zagrebelny discloses in Abstract and figs. 6-8 a semiconductor device fabrication method comprising the steps of: polishing a surface of a film-to-be-polished formed over a semiconductor substrate 140 with a polishing pad while only a polishing slurry is supplied onto the polishing pad to thereby planarize the surface of the film-to-be-polished (primary polishing step; col. 11, lines 62-67); and after the surface of the film-to-be-polished has been planarized (fig. 7), further polishing the surface of the film-to-be-polished with the polishing pad while polishing slurry and water are supplied onto the polishing pad (final polishing step with residual slurry particles 158 present on surface 156; fig. 7 and col. 14, lines 33-50), polishing slurry and water being supplied onto the polishing pad separately (Abstract and col. 14, lines 52-55); wherein polishing slurry comprises abrasive grains and a surfactant additive (col. 8, lines 2-16)

Zagrebelny fails to disclose the supply amount of the water is 2 or more times as much as a supply amount of the polishing slurry (claim 4); or the ratio of a supply amount of the second polishing material of the polishing slurry to a supply amount of the water is 1:5 (claim 34). Although the exact ratio of polishing slurry:water was not specified as recited in claims 4 and 34, it appears that the ratio as claimed is *prima facie* obvious due to the fact that one can vary the amount of polishing slurry and water to achieve a specific stable compound. This claim is *prima facie* obvious without showing that the claimed ranges achieve unexpected results relative to the prior art range. *In re Woodruff*, 16 USPQ2d 1935, 1937 (Fed. Cir. 1990). See also

In re Huang, 40 USPQ2d 1685, 1688 (Fed. Cir. 1996) (claimed ranges of a result effective variable, which do not overlap the prior art ranges, are unpatentable unless they produce a new and unexpected result which is different in kind and not merely in degree from the results of the prior art). See also In re Boesch, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA) (discovery of optimum value of result effective variable in known process is ordinarily within skill of art) and In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955) (selection of optimum ranges within prior art general conditions is obvious).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 12, 13, 28, 29 and 34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Vu whose telephone number is (571) 272-1798. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00am to 5:00pm. If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Loke H can be reached on (571) 272-1657. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/823,729
Art Unit: 2818

Page 7

/DAVID VU/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2818